APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,942	12/27/2000	Charles A. Eldering	T721-15	6478

27832   7590   05/24/2006

TECHNOLOGY, PATENTS AND LICENSING, INC./PRIME
2003 SOUTH EASTON RD
SUITE 208
DOYLESTOWN, PA 18901

EXAMINER
LAMBRECHT, CHRISTOPHER M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/748,942	ELDERING ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chris Lambrecht	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 February 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-11 and 15-23_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-11 and 15-23_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _2/06, 10/05, 8/05_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 21 February 2006 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. The amendments to claims 1, 15, and 23 fail to patentably distinguish over the prior art

of record. Specifically, Applicant argues that neither Hite nor Guyot teach a queue of targeted

advertisements having a controllable predetermined spacing, wherein the targeted advertisements are

repeatedly inserted (in a program stream for display) according to the spacing.

The amended claim limitations require that some index of space separating any two

advertisements within the queue be controllable, such that the spacing may be determined prior to

the moment of insertion. Further, the system repeatedly inserts commercials in the queue according

to this spacing.

Spacing, as claimed, could be a time interval, a number of intervening commercials, or any

other measure of space separating the playback of the commercials in the queue. The limitation

calling for repeated insertion of the advertisements according to the controllable spacing requires

that the system insert more than one commercial stored in the queue, according to the spacing.

Hite teaches storing a queue of advertisements at a subscriber site and inserting the

advertisements into a program stream according to controllable predetermined times or sequences

(col. 12, lines 3–27; col. 11, lines 40–57; col. 3, lines 8–17). The insertion times or sequences

employed in Hite constitute spacing between advertisements stored in the queue. Thus, the targeted

advertisements within Hite's queue have a controllable predetermined spacing. And the fact that

Hite teaches inserting a sequence of advertisements is evidence that the insertion process is

performed repeatedly, in accordance with the spacing.

As such, the amended claims fail to patentably distinguish over the prior art of record as set

forth in the rejections that follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims **1-11 and 15-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. 6,002,393 to Hite et al (hereinafter "Hite") in view of Guyot (of record).

Regarding **claims 1, 15, and 23**, Hite discloses, in a television network (fig. **1**), subscriber

equipment (at display site **400**, detailed in fig. **4**) and corresponding method for displaying targeted

advertisements to a subscriber (col. **6**, ll. **39-47**), the subscriber equipment comprising:

a communications interface (commercial processor **578** of set-top box **500**, fig.5) for

receiving at least one queue (targeted commercial display instructions/commercial targeting

information, col. **11**, ll. **45-51**) identifying a sequence of targeted advertisements (instructions indicate

which commercials to play, col. **4**, ll. **9-14**, and specify playback sequence of targeted commercials,

col. **3**, ll. **8-17**), wherein the at least one queue is selectively distributed to the subscriber and the

targeted advertisements have been previously matched to the subscriber (col. **7**, ll. **57-65**), and

wherein the targeted advertisements within the queue have a controllable predetermined spacing

(col. 12, lines 3–27; col. 11, lines 40–57; col. 3, lines 8–17);

memory (**612**, fig. **6**) for storing the at least one queue (col. **11**, ll. **22-27** and **53-54**; see also col. **4**, ll. **9-14**);

a processor (**600**, fig. **6**), responsive to the at least one queue, configured to repeatedly insert the targeted advertisements into avails in program streams (designated commercial times/spots, col. **12**, ll. **15-27**) for display, according to the controllable predetermined spacing, to the subscriber in accordance with the sequence (col. **11**, ll. **58-60**, col. **4**, ll. **53-56**, and col. **3**, ll.**8-17**), wherein the sequence is independent of the content of the corresponding program stream (col. **3**, ll. **8-17** and col. **5**, ll. **40-51**).

Hite fails to disclose a trigger circuit as claimed, but does disclose a frequency feature for tracking the number of successful exposures of targeted ads for contractual purposes (col. **2**, l. **66** - col. **3**, l. **8**).

In an analogous art, Guyot discloses a targeted ad system in which a queue of targeted ads is depleted (*i.e.*, reaches a low-level) responsive to, *inter alia*, a determination that individual ads specified therein have been successfully presented a given number of times, as established by their respective providers (col. **6**, l. **67** - col. **7**, l. **6** and col. **3**, l. **66** - col. **4**, l. **14**). Furthermore, Guyot discloses a trigger circuit for determining if the at least one queue has reached a low-level, wherein said communications interface refreshes the at least one queue in response to a low-level determination by said trigger circuit (col. **6**, ll. **64-67** and col. **7**, ll. **6-11**), thus keeping the ads queued for display to the subscriber up to date (col. **2**, ll. **29-36**).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the subscriber equipment of Hite to include a trigger circuit for determining if the at least one queue has reached a low-level, wherein said communications interface refreshes the at least one queue in response to a low-level determination by said trigger circuit, as taught by

Guyot, for the benefit of increasing advertising opportunities by continuously refreshing ads queued for display in accordance with fulfillment of prior advertisement contracts.

As to **claims 2 and 16**, Hite and Guyot together disclose the system and corresponding method of claims 1 and 15, further comprising a counter for tracking number of times each targeted advertisement is displayed to the subscriber (Hite, col. 2, l. 66 - col. 3, l. 8, and col. 3, ll. 29-40).

As to **claim 3**, Hite and Guyot together disclose the system of claim 1, wherein said communications interface also receives the targeted advertisements and said memory also stores said targeted advertisements (Hite, col. 12, ll. 3-27).

As to **claims 4 and 17**, Hite and Guyot together disclose the system and corresponding method of claims 3 and 15, wherein each targeted advertisement stored in memory is identified by an advertisement identifier that uniquely identifies the targeted advertisement and the at least one queue references the advertisement identifier (where data related to the usage of particular advertisement at the receiver site is maintained [see rejection of claim 3], there inherently exists a unique advertisement identifier; furthermore, presentation of particular commercials in a sequence according to the commercial display instructions [*i.e.*, queue; see rejection of claims 1 and 15] inherently requires said instructions reference said identifier).

As to **claims 5 and 18**, Hite and Guyot together disclose the system and corresponding method of claims 1 and 15, wherein for each targeted advertisement, the at least one queue includes advertiser data identifying the advertiser sponsoring the advertisement (where the usage a of a particular advertisement is subsequently referenced to the sponsoring advertiser [see rejection of claim 3], said queue inherently includes data which can identify said sponsoring advertiser).

As to **claims 6-8, and 19-21**, Hite and Guyot together disclose the system and corresponding method of claims 1 and 15, wherein for each targeted advertisement, the at least one

queue includes: a time frame defining a time during which the targeted advertisement should be displayed, including an hour frame, as claimed; and an expiration date of the targeted advertisement, as claimed (Guyot, col. 4, ll. 34-57).

As to **claims 9 and 22**, Hite and Guyot together disclose the system and corresponding method of claims 1 and 15, wherein said trigger circuit determines that the at least one queue has reached a low-level if the at least one queue has less than a predetermined number of targeted advertisements remaining (Guyot, col. 6, l. 64 - col. 7, l. 11).

As to **claim 10**, Hite and Guyot together disclose the system of claim 1. In addition, Hite discloses said communication interface is connectable to an advertising management system (200, fig. 1) over a network connection wherein the targeted advertisements are identified by the advertisement management system based on a profile of the subscriber supplied to the advertisement management system (col.7, ll. 7-36).

As to **claim 11**, Hite and Guyot together disclose the system of claim 1. In addition, Hite discloses the at least one queue includes a state indicator (low-level trigger) for activating said trigger circuit (Guyot, col. 6, l. 64 - col. 7, l. 11).

Conclusion

4.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on

the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory

period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Chris Lambrecht whose telephone number is (571) 272-7297. The examiner

can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

John Miller can be reached on M-F at (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chris Lambrecht
Examiner
Art Unit 2623

CL

JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600